

## **REMARKS**

The Office Action dated August 18, 2005 has been received and carefully noted. The following remarks are submitted as a full and complete response thereto. Claims 1-35 are currently pending in the application and are respectfully submitted for consideration.

In the Office Action, claims 1-5, 7, 13-17, 22-29, and 35 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,850,542 (hereinafter '542) in view of Mangin (U.S. Patent No. 6,704,280). Claims 6, 10, 11, 20, 21, 32, and 33 were rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claim 1 of U.S. Patent No. 6,850,542 (hereinafter '542) in view of Mangin further in view of Dreyer (U.S. Patent No. 6,098,103).

A terminal disclaimer was filed on June 1, 2005. The present Office Action implies that the terminal disclaimer was denied because it was not signed by an attorney of record. Applicants are not aware of the specific reasons for denying the terminal disclaimer because it was signed by an officer of the assignee, and, therefore should have been acceptable. In any case, a second terminal disclaimer signed by an attorney of record in the present application is submitted herewith, as discussed below.

A terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) and signed by an attorney of record is submitted herewith. Therefore, the above rejections of claims 1-5, 6,


7, 10, 11, 13-17, 20, 21, 22-29, 32, 33, and 35 is rendered moot. Applicants respectfully submit that the submission of the terminal disclaimer attached hereto places claims 1-5, 6, 7, 10, 11, 13-17, 20, 21, 22-29, 32, 33, and 35 in condition for allowance.

The Office Action indicated that claims 8, 9, 12, 18, 19, 30, 31, and 34 were objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As discussed above, Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 1, 14, and 24, upon which claims 8, 9, 12, 18, 19, 30, 31, and 34 are dependent, should be withdrawn. Consequently, all of currently pending claims 1-35 are in condition for allowance and Applicants respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case.

If for any reason the Examiner determines that the application is not now in condition for allowance, it is respectfully requested that the Examiner contact, by telephone, the applicant's undersigned attorney at the indicated telephone number to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this application.

In the event this paper is not being timely filed, the applicant respectfully petitions for an appropriate extension of time. Any fees for such an extension together with any additional fees may be charged to Counsel's Deposit Account 50-2222.

Respectfully submitted,



Douglas H. Goldhush  
Registration No. 33,125

**Customer No. 32294**  
SQUIRE, SANDERS & DEMPSEY LLP  
14<sup>TH</sup> Floor  
8000 Towers Crescent Drive  
Tysons Corner, Virginia 22182-2700  
Telephone: 703-720-7800  
Fax: 703-720-7802

MSA:jf

Enclosures: Terminal Disclaimer